

Remarks

Claims 1-15 are pending in this application. Claims 1-15 have been rejected. Claims 2 and 14 have been amended. For the following reasons, the rejection of Claims 1-15 is respectfully traversed.

The drawings have been objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) for allegedly not showing the claimed method steps. The objection to the drawings is respectfully traversed. It is respectfully submitted that Figure 2 does indeed convey the claimed method steps. Nonetheless, Applicant has added a new/additional Figure 3 illustrating the claimed method steps in flow chart form. No new matter has been added.

The specification has been amended to reflect the addition of Figure 3.

Claims 1-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner inquires whether the customer access module is the same thing as the remote customer access module. The answer to this inquiry is that the customer access module is the same thing as the remote customer access module.

The Examiner further inquires what the remote customer access module is. The answer to this inquiry can be found, *inter alia*, on page 3, lines 7-20 of the application.

With respect to Claims 14 and 15, the Examiner states that "a first interface and a second interface terminology is not found in the specification." It is noted that Claim 15 does not have this

terminology. With respect to Claim 14, as well as Claim 2, these claims have been amended to remove the "first" and "second" terminology, and to use terminology consistent with the specification and Figure 2. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Section 112 rejection has been overcome.

Claims 1-15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,026,160 to Stabler et al. ("Stabler"). For the following reasons, the Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed.

Stabler does not anticipate Applicant's invention, i.e., Stabler does not meet all of the claim limitations as required by 35 U.S.C. 102(b). As discussed on page 4, lines 1-12 of this application, Stabler discloses an ADSL Splitter, which cannot terminate DSL services, and which is used in conjunction with the existing customer access modules. To the contrary, Applicant's claims require a network interface unit module, which can terminate DSL services, and a customer access module which has circuitry compatible with the network interface unit module circuitry. Stabler does not anticipate this. The ADSL splitter is not the same as a network interface unit, nor does it require specific circuitry in the customer access module to be functional. Accordingly, Stabler does not anticipate Applications Claims 1-15.

Claim 15 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Figure 1 of the instant application. For the

following reasons, the Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed.

Figure 1 of the instant application does not make obvious Claim 15. Claim 15 requires, *inter alia*, providing a network interface unit module adapted to insert into the confines of one of the slot cavities of the network access compartment of a NID so that high speed telecommunication services can be terminated and delivered without having to replace or modify the NID. Figure 1 of the instant application is a traditional NID, which cannot provide high speed telecommunication services. Figure 1 does not teach, suggest or disclose placing a network interface unit module in the network access compartment of the NID (see page 2, line 21 to page 3, line 20, and page 11, lines 6-17 of the instant application). Accordingly, Figure 1 does not make obvious the limitations of Claim 15.

It is respectfully submitted that none of the prior art of record, either alone or in combination, fairly teaches, suggests or discloses the novel and unobvious features of Applicant's claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that the claims as presented herein are now in condition for allowance. An early notice allowance is respectfully requested.

Any arguments of the Examiner not specifically addressed should not be deemed admitted, conceded, waived, or acquiesced by Applicants. Any additional or outstanding matters the Examiner may have are respectfully requested to be disposed of by telephoning the undersigned.

A Petition for a three month extension of time is enclosed, along with a Form PTO-2038 in payment of the extension fee. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, including the extension fee if there is any problem with the credit card payment, to Deposit Account No. 16-0657.

A postcard is enclosed evidencing receipt of the same.

Respectfully submitted,

**PATULA & ASSOCIATES, P.C.**



Charles T. Riggs Jr.  
Reg. No. 37,430  
Attorney for Applicant

PATULA & ASSOCIATES, P.C.  
116 S. Michigan Avenue, 14th Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60603  
(312) 201-8220

58C37

Attachment